

1964

months after a fully manned and equipped bakery has been built in that country.

According to an Air Force report, between November 1, 1963, and March 1, 1964, the manning of their bakery in Peshawar, Pakistan, was 40 percent under strength and their production was hampered by the fact that a newly installed oven was not operating efficiently. Therefore, to guarantee a supply of American bread they ordered bread shipped from the United States via an ocean vessel to Karachi, Pakistan, and then airlifted to Peshawar, Pakistan.

The first airlift bread was received in Peshawar on January 20, 1964. By March 1, the difficulties at the bakery were fully restored; however, this bread airlift was operating so smoothly that it took 3 months to get it stopped, and as late as June 15 they were still flying fresh bread from the United States into Pakistan.

This is another typical example of bureaucratic inefficiency at its worst.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a letter dated July 31, 1964, signed by Col. William E. Poe, Department of the Air Force.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., July 31, 1964.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in response to your inquiry concerning the flying of fresh bread by the Air Force into Peshawar, Pakistan.

In view of your interest, the commander at Peshawar was contacted concerning this matter. He reports that during the period, November 1, 1963, to March 1, 1964, the manning of their bakery was 40 percent under strength and that production was further hampered by the fact that a newly installed oven was not operating efficiently. As a result, the bakery was unable to produce total troop issue and resale bread and pastry requirements. Therefore, frozen bread for resale was requisitioned and shipped from the United States via ocean vessel to Karachi, Pakistan, and then airlifted to Peshawar.

The following shipments were received in Peshawar:

	Pounds
Jan. 20, 1964.....	4,500
Apr. 15, 1964.....	3,000
Apr. 21, 1964.....	4,500
June 15, 1964.....	2,000

During March 1964, the manning and equipment deficiencies were corrected and cancellation action was taken on all outstanding requisitions for frozen bread. The latter three shipments, as indicated above, could not be canceled due to completion of procurement action stateside.

Your interest in Air Force activities is appreciated.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. POE,
Colonel, U.S. Air Force, Congressional
Inquiry Division, Office of Legislative
Liaison.

VISIT TO WASHINGTON OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS FROM OCONOMOWOC, WIS.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I should like to take a moment to call the attention of the Senate, and to pay my respects to, a very fine group of 83 students from the Oconomowoc, Wis. High School, who are in the Capitol and visiting Washington to see their Government in operation.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senators to an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of August 17, 1964. On August 8, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] and I urged the convening of a conference of nations which have an interest in southeast Asia. Having recently made our position clear, I believe it would be of interest to the Senate for me to read this editorial, published in the New York Times:

VIETNAMESE SHUFFLE

The situation in South Vietnam has been getting worse. This is why new measures are being taken to strengthen the internal structure and to give the American forces greater numbers and more authority. The form which these changes are taking is not so important as the fact that General Khanh and General Taylor will have more power.

A world that has seen so many changes in Vietnam while things remained the same must be excused for mingling skepticism with hope in greeting these latest shifts. Americans have been in the paradoxical position of keeping South Vietnam going, providing its military equipment, training its armed forces, and guaranteeing its protection against the Communists, under the name of "advisers." While this is largely, although not entirely, a fiction, it cannot overtly be changed because it would put the United States in the position of a white, colonial power intervening to run an Asian nation. Internally, there is the harsh reality of a relatively weak and insufficiently popular government facing an enemy—the Vietcong—which is gradually getting stronger.

This is the difficult situation that is being met by what seems to be a shuffling of the same old deck of cards. The hope is that the changes in the power structure will bring greater efficiency and strength. These are needed to prevent a collapse of the South Vietnam Government. The problems cannot be solved by smashing North Vietnam; they must be solved in the southern zone.

The inability to find solutions for Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia is bringing mounting pressures for negotiation. The United States has refused to yield to them because of a fear that it would show weakness, because of the need there would be to bring Communist China in on the talks, and because the subject of "neutralization" is, for the time being, taboo. However, it can be argued that the United States is now in a position to talk from strength, especially after its display of power and determination in the Gulf of Tonkin.

The present situation in southeast Asia is a stalemate in which neither side can win and neither will let the other win. This is normally a good time to talk. The whole

region is going through motions and getting nowhere.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRESS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, before addressing myself to the inequities of the proposal before the Senate, dealing with the Supreme Court reapportionment decisions, I wish to invite attention to some of the most remarkable legislative progress that has been made at this session of the Congress.

For years—indeed, for decades—with in our American society there has been a group of citizens, estimated to be almost 2 million, who have been almost wholly excluded from the abundance of our affluent society, leading lives that are the fortune of migration, following the corps from South to North each year, up the harvesting streams that run from Florida to New England, from Texas to Minnesota and Wisconsin, and from southern California to Oregon and Washington. These people lead wretched lives on incomes that average less than \$1,000 a year. They have not been included in most of the programs for better living that every one of us enjoys. They live in housing that all too frequently is occupied for 4, 5, or 6 weeks at a time. They are wholly bereft of any of the amenities of good living. Their youngsters are forced to shift for themselves, and lack much of the education that we take for granted. Over the years, Congress has fashioned several programs designed to deal with these problems.

This afternoon the most recent rung of progress was reached when the House of Representatives voted, 202 to 151, to pass the crew leader registration bill.

I am delighted to observe in the Chamber the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. He was most instrumental in the fashioning of the health program for migratory farmworkers, a program which has been enacted and is now operating. It is the law of our land and is operating in States where significant numbers of migrant workers are engaged in farm harvesting.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the kind comment of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. I was glad to join with him in promoting the health care bill and the bill for day care for children. It seems to me there was one

August 17

other bill in which I joined. However, I do not think I joined him on the bill for crew leaders. Does the Senator recall? It occurs to me that that was a bill on which we did not see entirely alike.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We had productive discussions over many sessions. The distinguished Senator from Florida was not, as is sometimes said in conference, adamant in opposition to that bill. However, as I recall, the health bill was the measure for which we both felt most hopeful. The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the senior Senator from Florida were the real architects of that legislation, which means so much to people in the more than 30 States where the program has been accepted.

Other progress can be seen in the anti-poverty bill, passed by the Senate, in which were included the sanitation program and the day care program, of which the Senator from Florida spoke, as well as a program for regular education.

The housing bill contains a program in which I believe the farmers of the country, in areas where there are concentrations of migrant workers, can, through nonprofit associations, meet many of the urgent housing needs of their workers.

Mr. HOLLAND. I again thank the Senator from New Jersey. I joined him also in the housing program; but as to the crew leader program, he and I never could get entirely together. However, as one should in such circumstances, I congratulate him upon his well-earned victory.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Florida. The crew leader bill, which passed the other body today, is substantially the bill that passed the Senate at an earlier time. There are three or four changes, none of them substantial. This has led me to propose to the chairman of the full committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], that the Senate accept the changes made in the House, so that this measure can become yet another law to be signed by the President.

I began by saying that for decades our migrant workers have been left out of the social and economic progress of this country. Now, in one session of Congress, we are catching up to many of their desperate human needs with programs that can bring some hope to those who have led incredibly wretched lives.

Another remarkable achievement in this Congress concerns another problem that has long been overlooked in terms of national attention through legislative action. That is the urban transit program which, as I read the comment from all over the country, has created considerable hope that on a sharing basis the communities hardest hit by traffic congestion can have a new partner in trying to unscramble their commuter transportation problems. There is not a metropolitan area of the country that does not have a period during each working day when frightful traffic congestion produces long delays, great anxiety, danger,

and, beyond that, the loss of billions of dollars a year. The transit bill has been enacted, and metropolitan communities across the country are beginning to do their regional planning so that they can discover whether their plans for better urban communications through transportation can be a part of that program.

I observe in the Chamber the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, who represents, in part, a State which has one of the great urban centers of the Nation. Unwittingly, it is the huge automobile industry of his State that causes so many transportation problems. It creates jobs for America, comfort for us some of the time, but is the cause of the concentration of automobile traffic in the downtown urban areas that presents us with so much difficulty at the commuter hour.

As a result of this, we have initiated a program of demonstrating that if the working man or woman can get into an automobile at home and drive to a convenient parking area near a mass transit facility, it can be a great deal more efficient in carrying the worker all the way on his journey into town.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. I compliment the Senator on his efforts in the direction of solving the problems in the mass transit industry. In general, I agree with his statement.

He mentions my home State, and particularly my home city, where we sometimes believe the source of the trouble to be the automobile—which I confess is hard to refute. However, Detroit is one of the cities which has a great problem. Through the efforts of the Senator from New Jersey, not only this year but also in past sessions of Congress, some helpful studies have been made. I believe that we can begin to see a ray of hope in the studies which have been made.

It will require a certain amount of re-education of the general public to get them to accept the theory of parking on the periphery of a city, or parking on the periphery of a downtown area, and then taking a mass transit bus or rail facility into the center of a city. I would have hoped at the outset that the public would have accepted much sooner the necessity to do this, but we find that there is great resistance on the part of the automobile driver against leaving his car outside the downtown area, if he is employed or engaged in business in the downtown area. It seems to me that everyone has the feeling that a car is a sort of crutch, and that we cannot get away from it, that in an emergency in business or family life, the automobile should always be close at hand, that if a client should call up from an airport and wants to talk to someone about an important matter, that someone does not wish to be delayed in getting out to the airport to meet his party. In the kind of

economy we live in today, sometimes a matter of a few minutes is very important.

So an uphill fight is ahead for us. I congratulate the Senator on his efforts and assure him that I see some sign of improvement in the area. Some results of the studies have already taken place. I hope that he will continue his efforts and not become discouraged.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I thank the Senator for his comments.

With the recent enactment of the bill, I am encouraged—particularly by the response of the metropolitan communities. As I stated earlier, I did not wish to say anything which might be construed to mean that the automobile is a bad thing. What we wish to do is to maximize the efficiency of the automobile. Certainly, I share the hope that America will soon see three-car families, since most of our more fortunate citizens have been able to go to Detroit twice at the same time, as it were, and purchase two automobiles.

However, there is a cloud on the transit horizon, to which I wish to address myself.

Going back to the concept of the legislation and the reason for it, we know that urban transit, when forced to pay for every improvement out of the fare box, is faced with an economic situation in which it could not afford to improve, because it would have to raise fares—and when fares are raised riders are lost.

There has been a vicious cycle, depending exclusively on the fare box as the source of capital improvements. This program is addressed to that factor. It is on a sharing basis of local contribution and local government contribution.

Now we see this cloud no smaller than a small hand, but it is on the horizon. I wish the Record to reflect the potential hazard of the approach suggested as an amendment to H.R. 10467, Calendar No. 1175. This amendment was submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. It is not germane to H.R. 10467. That deals with accrued vacation pay, while this amendment deals with the Urban Transportation Act.

The amendment suggests that the Department of Commerce undertake a study and report back in about a year on the feasibility of taxing those urban transit systems which would be beneficiaries under the Urban Transportation Act.

This, of course, on its face, is wholly self-defeating of the program. The very reason we have had to add the incentive and stimulant of a Federal contribution is that transit systems cannot themselves afford this contribution.

The net effect would be to increase the Federal contribution. Now it goes up to two-thirds net project cost. The net project cost is that part of the improvement that cannot be paid for out of the fare box. If we take away from the fare box an additional tax, we increase the net project cost, which increases the Federal contribution. I should like the Record to reflect this point at this moment because the bill might be called up at any time. Certainly, the 50 or more Senators who voted for the urban transit bill in this body will not wish to see their